

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT &amp; TRADEMARK OFFICE

#4/Response  
Hawkins  
3/8/02

Appln. Ser. No.:	Filed:	Inventor(s):	Atty Dkt:
09/825,418	3 April 2000	Y. Awakura	114GI-135 (0694-135)
Title: Wiring Board Comprising Granular Magnetic Film			
Examiner: Q. Vu			Art Unit: 2841

Asst. Comm'r for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231-0001

4 Pages Total **VIA FACSIMILE**  
703-308-7724

FAX COPY RECEIVED

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
and Petition for Extension of Time**

MAR 6 - 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Dear Sir:

In complete response to the Office Action mailed 7 November 2001, the period for response being extended one month to 7 March 2002 by the Petition at the end of this paper, reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Restriction Requirement

Applicants confirm their election, without traverse, to prosecute claims 1, 2, 4-19, 22-24, and 26-39.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 19, 22-24, and 27-28 stand rejected as anticipated by Higgins, III ("Higgins" hereinafter). The rejection alleges that Higgins discloses

"magnetic thin films (26, also see col. 12, lines 25-30) formed on the conductor pattern." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The portion of column 12 cited in the rejection appears irrelevant to the claimed invention, and the first paragraph of the Detailed Description supports the inapplicability of the reference : "The prior art of bulky metal sheet shields and the inadequate shielding of thin film coated plastic system enclosures is replaced in the present invention by a highly efficient, low mass shield coating(s)." (Col. 4, ln. 22-25.) The next paragraph of the Higgins specification (ln. 31-35) goes on to state that a conducting layer is coated with a thin layer of polymer. A search of the text of the Higgins patent from the USPTO's website indicates that the above-quoted section is the only occurrence of the phrase "thin film." Accordingly, Higgins does not disclose any "thin film" structure, and so this rejection should be withdrawn.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5-6, 8-18, 26, and 29-38 stand rejected as obvious over Higgins, which rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection alleges that it is well-known that polyimide is a flexible material for electronic substrates, but no art is provided to support such an assertion, and so the examiner is requested (37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2)) to support such a contention. Further, Higgins merely states (col. 5, ln. 42-46) that the substrate can be flexible; no materials are discussed. As the *Leshin* case cited by the examiner only relates to the obviousness of a particular plastic when it was

well-known to make the claimed articles of plastic, this rejection fails to show that Higgins contemplates a polymeric substrate in the first place.

This traversal is equally applicable to the rejection of claims 9-10, 13, and 35-36, and the citation to *Leshin*, for the examiner has not shown that any of the recited materials is conventional in the claimed application, and so *Leshin* is inapplicable unless it is first shown that the genus or sub-genus of the material is conventional, keeping in mind that the materials in these rejected claims encompass non-metals, metals, and alloys.

The same traversal is made with respect to the rejection of claims 8, 11-12, 14-18, 29-34, and 37-38. While Higgins has an entire section on choosing suitable filler materials for the shielding layers (col. 12), there is nothing teaching anything about selection of the material for the substrate, and so no suggestion for any of the materials recited in these rejected claims.

The examiner's refusal to consider the process limitations in rejected claims 6 and 26, with citation to MPEP 2113, is contrary to law as these claims are not product-by-process claims. Furthermore, as the corresponding reference structure has been shown above to be a polymer filled with magnetic shielding material, the examiner is requested to provide *any* reference showing that a polymeric layer, or a filled polymeric layer as used by Higgins, can be made by the claimed sputtering or vapor deposition methods, prior to maintaining this rejection for obviousness.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of all the rejections, and further and favorable action on the elected claims, in the form of a notice of allowance, are believed to be in order, and are earnestly solicited. To the extent that the elected claims are allowed, the examiner is authorized to cancel the non-elected claims.

Change in Attorney

Please note that this application has been transferred to the undersigned, and that a revocation and new power of attorney will be filed in the near future.

Petition for Extension of Time

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for a one month extension of time to 7 March 2002 in order to respond to the Office Action dated 7 November 2001. Please debit Deposit Acct. 502144 for the \$ 110.00 extension fee and any other fees this paper should necessitate under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR  
TRANSMISSION – 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that I have a reasonable basis that this paper, along with any referred to above, (i) are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or (ii) are being transmitted to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.6(d).

DATE:

6 March 2002

NAME:

Brad Ruben

SIGNATURE:

Brad Ruben

Respectfully submitted,

COPY RECEIVED

MAR 6 - 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Bradley N. Ruben  
Bradley N. Ruben, Reg. No. 32,058  
Bradley N. Ruben, PC  
463 First St., Suite 5A  
Hoboken, NJ 07030-1859  
201-239-0707 (fax -0734)  
mail@rubenpatent.com

6 March 2002